



## MEMORANDUM

To: Northgate Stakeholders and Alternates  
From: Mark Troxel, DPD  
Date: April 30, 2004  
Re: **Written public comments from April 20 Stakeholders meeting**

At the Stakeholders' April 20 meeting, we received four completed public comment forms. Two of these (Respondents A and B below) were on the "Discussion Questions" form distributed in association with the discussion on stormwater concepts. The other two were (Respondents C and D) on the blue "We Want to Hear From You" form available at every meeting. Subsequent to the meeting, we received two additional comments via email, which are attached to this memo.

### **From the "Discussion Questions" Form:**

1. What comments do you have about the have about the Northgate South Lot Natural System Drainage and Open Space analysis?

**Respondent A:** It is intended that Northgate becomes an "Urban Center." Isn't it time for a good 3-D scale model of the area? And now, especially, the South Lot!

**Respondent B:** Some kind of model would be helpful.

Address future maintenance.

Plantings should be native.

SPU has done an excellent job!

2. The "benefits comparison" chart identified criteria related to drainage, environmental and community benefits. Are there other criteria you think should be considered?

**Respondent A:** I am unimpressed by a deep ravine cut into the area with the prospect of dead, scummy vegetation spread along a periodic contrived streambed.

**Respondent B:** I think the water flow is an important issue, which was listed but not completely understood by all.

3. What one thing would you like the City Council to keep in mind when it reviews the drainage analysis results?

**Respondent A:** Is this the best application of about \$7 million of SPU budget? What else could be done, maybe downstream, to detain and clarify stormwater, even up to the 100 year storm?

**Respondent B:** That if we are going to this expense, [result] should have continual water flows (Daylight or Hybrid!).

Should benefit wildlife.

Benefit of green space for us and future generations.

Maintenance.

**From the “We Want to Hear From You” Form:**

- South Lot Development Presentation

**Respondent C:** Limited and useful.

- South Lot Stormwater Concepts Presentation and Discussion:

**Respondent C:** Not enough detail on the alternatives for stakeholders to understand what the three alternatives look like and how they would function. The draft Benefit Comparison Chart was not helpful. The benefits are too vague, misleading and don't include enough detail to have any kind of meaningful discussion.

**Respondent D:** Question: One slide shows *per acre water quality benefits* and one shows *total water quality benefits*. Why would we care about *per acre*? It seems like *total water quality benefit* is the critical factor to look at.

- The Coordinated transportation Investment Plan

**Respondent C:** I think the questions asked by stakeholders about assumptions, what decisions have already been made, and what the stakeholders can decide on.

- Urban Centers and 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. Streetscape Update:

**Respondent C:** Not discussed or I missed it.

- Community Forum Planning:

**Respondent C:** It's not clear to me why this is going to occur. We tried four of these types of meetings with the Thornton Creek Watershed Management Committee and few people showed up at any of the forums.